



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,169	08/30/2006	Frederic A. Macdonald	06780069US	6063
43891 7590 07/09/2009 LAW OFFICE OF BRETT N. DORNY 386 WEST MAIN STREET SUITE 12A NORTHBOROUGH, MA 01532				
EXAMINER RAVETTI, DANTE				
ART UNIT 3685		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/591,169

**Applicant(s)**

MACDONALD ET AL.

**Examiner**

DANTE RAVETTI

**Art Unit**

3685

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 41-57 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 August 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Acknowledgements***

1. This communication is in response to a Request for Continued Examination of Application No. 10/591,169 filed on May 13, 2009.
2. Claims 1-40 have been canceled by the Applicant.
3. Claims 41-57 are currently pending.

### ***Election/Restriction***

4. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. §121:
  - I. Claims 41-48 are drawn to collecting funds, classified in Class 705, Subclass 64;
  - II. Claim 49 is drawn to coupon distribution, classified in class 705, Subclass 14;
  - III. Claims 50-57 are drawn to database (e.g. memory devices), classified in Class 707, Subclass 1;
5. The inventions are distinct, each from the other, because of the following reasons:
  6. Inventions I through III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as collecting funds, subcombination II has a separate utility such as coupon distribution, subcombination III has a separate utility as a database. See MPEP §806.05(d).

7. The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together.

Where Applicants elects a subcombination and claims thereto as subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR §1.104. See MPEP §821.04(a).

8. Because the inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

9. Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these inventions listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required because one or more of the following reasons apply:

- (a) the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification;
- (b) the invention have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter;
- (c) the invention require a different field of search (for example, searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries);
- (d) the prior art applicable to one invention would not likely be applicable to another invention;
- (e) the invention are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. §101 and/or 35 U.S.C. §112, 1st paragraph.

10. **Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of an invention to be examined** even though the requirement

may be traversed (37 C.F.R. §1.143) and (ii) **Identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.**

11. The election of an invention may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a rights to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversals must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention.

12. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected invention.

13. Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In their instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) of the other invention.

14. A telephone call was not made.

### ***Conclusion***

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Mr. Dante Ravetti whose telephone number is

(571) 270-3609. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday  
9:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the  
examiner's supervisor, Mr. Calvin Hewitt may be reached at (571) 272-6709. The  
fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is  
assigned is (571) 270-4609.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from  
the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information  
for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public  
PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through  
Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system see  
<http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the private  
PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 1-(866)  
217-9197. If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service  
Representative or access to the automated information system, call 1-(800) 786-  
9199 (IN USA or CANADA) or 1-(571) 272-1000.

/Dante Ravetti/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3685  
Wednesday, July 01, 2009

/Calvin L Hewitt II/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3685